

Molecular dynamics simulations of shear-induced thermophoresis and non-Newtonian flow in compressible fluids

Madhu Priya^{*1, a)} and Yitzhak Rabin^{1, 2, b)}

¹⁾*Department of Physics and Institute of Nanotechnology and Advanced Materials, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan 52900, Israel*

²⁾*NYU-ECNU Institutes of Physics and Mathematical Sciences at NYU Shanghai, 3663 Zhongshan Road North, Shanghai, 200062, China*

(Dated: 31 March 2017)

We use molecular dynamics simulations to study the behavior of a compressible Lennard-Jones fluid in simple shear flow in a two-dimensional nanochannel. The system is equilibrated in the fluid phase close to the triple point at which gas, liquid and solid phases coexist and is subjected to steady shear in Couette geometry. It is observed that at higher shear rates, the system develops a density gradient perpendicular to the direction of flow and exhibits solid-like layering near the boundaries. Both the number of solid-like layers and the number of layers that move with the velocity of the neighboring wall, increase with the shear rate. We argue that the inhomogeneous density profile develops as the consequence of thermophoresis due to the non-uniform temperature profile produced by shear-induced viscous heating in the simulated flow cell. The above phenomena are accompanied by non-Newtonian effects such as nonlinear velocity profiles, inhomogeneous stress distributions and shear rate dependent viscosity which exhibits shear thinning followed by shear thickening as the shear rate is increased. The connection between these phenomena is discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Molecular dynamics (MD) is an important tool for investigating properties of a fluid under flow and is often used to explore systems under conditions which are difficult to achieve and control in experiments, e.g., flows at high shear rates in nanochannels¹. The boundary conditions (BC's) for such computer experiments are very important, especially for systems of nanoscale dimensions in which properties of the wall-fluid interface have a significant effect on the flow. Some of the earlier MD simulations of Couette flow considered smooth walls and reported wall slip². However, a more recent study showed that for wetting liquids, slip arises only at very high shear rates at which the response of the fluid to the applied shear is no longer linear³. Some authors introduced the no-slip BC's explicitly, i.e., they assumed that the fluid layer next to the wall moves with the velocity of the wall, but subsequent studies have shown that imposition of such BC's is incorrect since whether the fluid particles will slip at the wall or not, depends on the strength of the wall-fluid interaction^{4,5}.

Along with implementing the correct BC's, it is important to control the temperature in the system by choosing a thermostat which closely mimics experiment and is computationally efficient. Recent computer simulation studies showed that the choice of a thermostat has major effects on fluid flow at high shear rates in confined channels^{6,7}. The authors considered several scenarios: (1) thermostating the wall (TW), (2) the fluid (TF) and (3) both the wall and the fluid (TWTF). In TW the walls

are made up of particles which are tethered by springs to their equilibrium lattice positions. TW simulations can reproduce the temperature profiles in actual experiments where the extra heat due to shear is dissipated through the walls. However, since the wall particles are oscillating around their mean positions on some characteristic time scale, the effective roughness of the walls depends on the applied shear rate and therefore TW simulations fail to describe systems in which wall roughness does not depend on the flow rate. In order to maintain constant wall roughness a possible choice is to use TF. This can be done either by assuming a linear velocity profile (profile-biased thermostat), or by measuring the actual velocity profile obtained in the simulation and implementing the thermostat using this profile (profile-unbiased thermostat). A profile-biased thermostat is limited in its accuracy since in many cases the linear velocity profile assumption breaks down at high shear rates. While this problem can be solved by using a profile-unbiased thermostat, TF thermostats cannot reproduce the experimental conditions in which only the walls are thermostated. Finally, TWTF simulations are computationally expensive and tend to distort the effects of viscous heating on fluid dynamics that become increasingly important at higher shear rates.

In the present work, we use MD simulations to study the effect of simple shear on a fluid of monodisperse particles that interact with each other via a Lennard-Jones (LJ) potential and are confined in a two-dimensional (2D) nanochannel. In order to amplify the effects of shear on the temperature and density profiles in the nanochannel, we study this system in the region of the phase diagram where the compressibility is large, i.e., at the triple point density and at temperature that is slightly higher than that of the liquid-solid transition. Steady shear is applied by moving the upper wall with a constant velocity

^{a)}Electronic mail: madhuatjnu@gmail.com

^{b)}Electronic mail: yitzhak.rabin@biu.ac.il

while the lower wall remains at rest throughout the simulation. The walls are made of particles which are fixed with respect to each other and therefore the roughness of wall remains constant during the simulation. We thermostat two layers of fluid particles next to each wall^{8,9}, and therefore allow temperature gradients to develop between the walls and the bulk of the fluid at high shear rates where shear-induced heating becomes important.

The paper is organized as follows. We provide details of our simulation setup in Sec. II. In Sec. III we present the calculated density, flow and temperature profiles, discuss the connection between these results and thermophoresis in temperature gradients and analyze the various non-Newtonian characteristics of flow at high shear rates. We conclude the paper by summarizing and discussing our results in Sec. IV.

II. SIMULATION DETAILS

The fluid particles interact with each other via the LJ potential,

$$U_{LJ}(r) = 4\epsilon \left[\left(\frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^{12} - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^6 \right], \quad (1)$$

which is terminated and shifted at $r = r_{\text{cut}} = 2.5\sigma$, so that the truncated potential $\bar{U}_{LJ}(r)$ is defined as,

$$\bar{U}_{LJ}(r) = \begin{cases} U_{LJ}(r) - U_{LJ}(r_{\text{cut}}) & \text{if } r < r_{\text{cut}} \\ 0 & \text{if } r \geq r_{\text{cut}} \end{cases}$$

We use reduced LJ units in which the interaction parameter ϵ , the mass m and length scale σ are taken to be unity (the Boltzmann constant is taken as unity as well). The simulations are performed in NVT ensemble. The dynamics is solved by using a velocity-Verlet integrator with a time step of $\delta t = 0.005\tau_{LJ}$, where $\tau_{LJ} = \sigma(m/\epsilon)^{1/2} = 1$ is the LJ time unit. Most of the results were obtained at triple point density (0.694) that corresponds to $N = 1600$ particles in an area of $48\sigma \times 48\sigma$ (other densities were obtained by changing the number of particles at fixed volume of the system). The nanochannel is constructed by placing two parallel solid walls at $y = 0$ and $y = L_y$, where $L_y = 48\sigma$ is the distance between the walls. Each of the walls is made of 43 particles with centers located at positions $y = 0$ and $y = 48\sigma$, respectively, such that the horizontal separation between the wall particles is 1.12σ , which corresponds to the minimum of the LJ potential. The wall-fluid particle interactions are the same as between fluid particles. Periodic boundary conditions with period $L_x = 48\sigma$ along the x direction are imposed.

We start the simulation from a configuration in which the fluid particles are placed on a square lattice, between the two solid walls. The initial velocity of the i th fluid particle is chosen from a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution at temperature T , to which we add a velocity given by

the product of the y -position of the particle and the shear rate where the latter is defined by the constant velocity of the upper wall $U\hat{x}$ as $\dot{\gamma} = U/L$. The distance between the walls is kept fixed during the simulation.

The fluid particles obey the following equations of motion,

$$\mathbf{v}_i\left(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}\right) = \mathbf{v}_i(t) + \frac{\Delta t}{2}\mathbf{F}_i(t), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{r}_i(t + \Delta t) = \mathbf{r}_i(t) + \mathbf{v}_i\left(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}\right)\Delta t, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_i\left(t + \Delta t\right) = \mathbf{v}_i\left(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}\right) + \frac{\Delta t}{2}\mathbf{F}_i\left(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}\right). \quad (4)$$

In the above set of equations $\mathbf{v}_i(t)$ and $\mathbf{F}_i(t)$ represent the instantaneous velocity of particle i and the instantaneous force acting on it, respectively.

In order to define a local instantaneous temperature $T(y, t)$, we divide the system into 40 bins along y -axis such that each bin contains approximately a single layer of particles. The average velocity of particles in bin α is defined as

$$\mathbf{u}_\alpha(t) = \frac{1}{N_\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{N_\alpha} \mathbf{v}_i(t), \quad (5)$$

where we sum over the instantaneous velocities of the N_α particles in this bin. We define the peculiar velocity of particle i in this bin as¹⁰

$$\mathbf{v}_i^p(t) = \mathbf{v}_i(t) - \mathbf{u}_\alpha(t). \quad (6)$$

Note that the peculiar velocity is defined in the rest frame of the average particle in the bin and can therefore be used to define the local temperature in the α th bin as

$$T_\alpha(t) = \frac{\sum_i^{N_\alpha} [\mathbf{v}_i^p(t)]^2}{2(N_\alpha - 1)}. \quad (7)$$

where, in the denominator, we subtracted 2 from the number of degrees of freedom ($2N_\alpha$) in the α -th bin because they were already included in the definition of local streaming velocity, Eq. (5). A constant temperature (T) is maintained near the walls by thermostating two liquid layers adjacent to each wall ($\alpha = 1, 2$ and $\alpha = 39, 40$, respectively) using velocity rescaling. At each time step the velocities of the particles in the above four bins are rescaled by a factor λ defined in terms of the instantaneous temperature $T_\alpha(t)$ and the fixed temperature T as $\lambda = \sqrt{(T/T_\alpha(t))}$. The above procedure allows us to maintain simultaneously constant roughness of the walls and a physically realistic temperature distribution inside the simulation box.

III. RESULTS

Typical snapshots of the system in equilibrium $\dot{\gamma} = 0$ and under strong shear $\dot{\gamma} = 0.3$, are shown in Figs. 1(a)




FIG. 1. Snapshots of the system at $T = 0.44$ and $\rho = 0.694$, where wall particles and fluid particles are shown as red and black solid discs, respectively. (a) at equilibrium, $\dot{\gamma} = 0$ and (b) in steady shear, $\dot{\gamma} = 0.3$.

and 1(b), respectively. Even though strong density fluctuations are observed in both figures, inspection of Fig. 1(a) shows that (with the exception of 1 – 2 fluid layers near the walls where some ordering is visible) the average density is uniform across the system in equilibrium. This is not the case in the high shear limit where the steady state density is minimal at the center of the system ($y = L/2$) and strongly increases towards the walls, Fig. 1(b).

In order to quantify the effect of steady shear on the density profile we divide the system into 400 bins and average the density in each bin over x and over time. The resulting equilibrium and steady state profiles $\langle \rho(y) \rangle$ are plotted in Fig. 2. While density oscillations are clearly observed in both cases, the amplitudes of the peaks increase and their width and the separation between them decrease with shear rate, a signature of shear-induced solid-like layering near the walls. The ratio of the amplitudes of the corresponding high shear rate and equilibrium peaks *increases* with distance from the walls, in agreement with the observation of shear-induced broadening of the solid-like boundary layers in Figs. 1(a) and 1(b). Note that the enhancement and broadening of solid-like layering is accompanied by reduction of the bulk density ρ_b in the center of the channel, to a lower value (0.63) than the average density of the system (0.694).

Having established the effect of shear on the density profile we turn to examine its effect on the flow by measuring the y -dependence of the average velocity $\langle v_x(y) \rangle$ for a range of applied shear rates (the average velocity of the particles in the y -direction vanishes, as expected on symmetry grounds). To this end we divide the system into 100 bins along the y direction (we choose a lower number of bins as compared to the density measurements, to avoid bins with zero particles). As shown in Fig. 3, around shear rate of 0.05 one begins to observe deviations from a linear velocity profile, $v_x(y) = \dot{\gamma}y$. These deviations manifest themselves in the formation of a boundary layer that moves together with the neighbor-




FIG. 2. Comparison of $\langle \rho(y) \rangle$ at equilibrium and at steady state $\dot{\gamma} = 0.3$, for $T = 0.44$ and $\rho = 0.694$.




FIG. 3. Open symbols show average velocity of the particles along x -axis in different bins constructed according to their y -position for $\dot{\gamma} \geq 0.05$. The dashed lines show a linear velocity profile corresponding to each shear rate.

ing wall (and another boundary layer that remains at rest with respect to the stationary wall). This phenomenon has been previously observed in the case of strong wall-fluid interactions in a three dimensional LJ system and has been referred to as *locking*⁴. When the shear rate is further increased, the number of layers moving with the wall velocity increases and the velocity gradients in the bulk of the system increase as well beyond their nominal value ($\dot{\gamma}$).

Since we would like to gain insight about the origin of the observed layering and locking phenomena we proceed to examine the temperature profiles that develop in the system with increasing shear rate. We find that the temperature profile is parabolic (in y), with a maximum at the center of the system (the height of this maximum increases with shear rate as $\dot{\gamma}^2$ - see inset in Fig. 4), and decreases to the nominal temperature T at the two

thermostated layers near each wall, as shown in Fig. 4. Similar temperature profiles were also observed in other computer simulations of shear flow^{7,11}. This concurs with the expectation that shear-induced viscous heating leads to higher temperature gradients, since the only way to remove excess heat from the system is to increase these gradients in order to enhance the diffusion of heat towards the thermostated walls.




FIG. 4. Filled symbols show the temperature profile for various shear rates as mentioned in the legend. The lines are a guide to the eye. The inset shows the dependence of maximum of the temperature profile on the applied shear rate.

In order to check whether the temperature profiles completely determine the corresponding density profiles (at the same shear rates), in Fig. 5 we compare the steady state density profile of a sheared fluid with $\dot{\gamma} = 0.3$ to that of a fluid at rest but with an identical temperature profile. Since the resulting density profiles are indistinguishable, we conclude that shear-induced layering arises as the result of the coupling between density and temperature gradients in the sheared fluid and thus the density depends on the shear rate through its effect on the temperature profile, i.e., $\langle \rho(y) \rangle$ is a function of $\langle T(y) \rangle$ only.

In the absence of shear, the coupling between local temperature and concentration profiles gives rise to thermophoresis, also known as the Ludwig-Soret effect^{12–14}. Although the Ludwig-Soret effect has been mostly studied in colloidal dispersions and binary mixtures^{15–17}, self-thermophoresis in compressible single-component fluids has also been discussed¹⁸. Since in our case, the temperature profile depends on the shear rate, we expect the Soret coefficient $S_T(\dot{\gamma})$ to be a function of $\dot{\gamma}$.

In order to calculate $S_T(\dot{\gamma})$, we make use of the fact that our compressible fluid can be considered as a binary mixture of particles and vacancies. Defining ρ_b as the density profile at the center of the flow channel $y/L = 0.5$ (note that ρ_b is a function of $\dot{\gamma}$), the equation that connects the steady-state distribution of the average density of particles $\langle \rho(y) \rangle$ to the steady-state temperature gradi-




FIG. 5. The density profile obtained for equilibrium fluid (black thick line) is compared to that obtained for $\dot{\gamma} = 0.3$ (red solid line), both with identical temperature profile.

ent $\langle T(y) \rangle$ is¹⁹,

$$\frac{\partial \langle \rho \rangle}{\partial y} = -S_T \rho_b (1 - \rho_b) \frac{\partial \langle T \rangle}{\partial y}. \quad (8)$$

Note that while the temperature profile $\langle T(y) \rangle$ is al-




FIG. 6. The filled symbols give the density profiles in the bulk fluid for different shear rates (see legend). The solid lines are parabolic fits.

ways parabolic, the density profile $\langle \rho(y) \rangle$ is not (compare Figs. 4 and 5). Upon some reflection we conclude that the linear response relation Eq. 8 is valid only in the central region of the channel, where the deviations from ρ_b are small. In Fig. 6 we show that the measured density profiles in the region $0.2 \leq y/L \leq 0.8$ away from the walls, are indeed parabolic and therefore the density and the temperature profiles can be fitted by the quadratic expressions $\langle \rho(y, \dot{\gamma}) \rangle = a(\dot{\gamma}) \times (y - 0.5)^2 + \rho_b(\dot{\gamma})$ and $\langle T(y, \dot{\gamma}) \rangle = b(\dot{\gamma}) \times (y - 0.5)^2 + T_b(\dot{\gamma})$ respectively. In these expressions, a and b are the constants obtained by fitting the density and temperature plots with a parabola and T_b is the temperature at $y/L = 0.5$. Substituting the

above expressions into Eq. 8 we obtain the following expression for the Soret coefficient S_T :

$$S_T(\dot{\gamma}) = -\frac{a}{b\rho_b(\dot{\gamma})[1 - \rho_b(\dot{\gamma})]}. \quad (9)$$

S_T as a function of shear rate $\dot{\gamma}$ is plotted in Fig. 7. The equilibrium Soret coefficient ($S_T \approx 8$) can be obtained upon extrapolating the available data points to $\dot{\gamma} = 0$.




FIG. 7. The Soret coefficient like parameter is shown for different shear rates (solid circles). The solid line is a guide to the eye.

Since at high shear rates large deviations from the linear velocity profile are observed, we expect other signatures of non-Newtonian fluid behavior to appear as well (e.g., a non-uniform distribution of stresses, shear thinning/thickening of viscosity, etc). In order to compute the stress tensor from our MD results, we express the xy component of the microscopic stress tensor in terms of instantaneous particle velocities and interparticle forces:

$$\sigma_{xy} = \sum_{i=1}^N m v_x^i v_y^i + \sum_{j>i}^N r_{ijx} F_{ijy}. \quad (10)$$

We then divide the system into 20 layers (bins) along the y -axis and average the stress in each layer over x and over time. As expected, at lower shear rates (e.g., $\dot{\gamma} = 0.01$), the shear stress is distributed uniformly perpendicular to the direction of flow. At higher shear rates $\langle \sigma_{xy} \rangle$ becomes a function of y , with a minimum at the center of the channel (Fig. 8).

The shear viscosity η_{xy} is given by

$$\eta_{xy} = \frac{\langle \langle \sigma_{xy} \rangle \rangle}{\dot{\gamma}}, \quad (11)$$

where $\langle \rangle$ denotes averaging over the volume of the system and over time. In Fig. 9, we present the shear viscosity η_{xy} as a function of shear rate $\dot{\gamma}$. Within the accuracy of our simulation, the viscosity remains constant up to




FIG. 8. In the upper panel shear stress is shown across 20 bins in the y -direction at $\dot{\gamma} = 0.01$. In the lower panel, we show the same plot at $\dot{\gamma} = 0.3$.




FIG. 9. In the main figure shear viscosity η_{xy} is shown for shear rates between 0.001 to 0.4. In the inset η_{xy} for shear rates 0.001-0.01 is presented. The range 0.001-0.01 is repeated in the inset for clarity.

$\dot{\gamma} \approx 0.01$ (see inset in Fig. 9). As the shear rate is further increased, there is a gradual transition to a shear thinning regime in which viscosity decreases with increasing shear rate. This regime extends up to $\dot{\gamma} \approx 0.1$ at which point shear thinning is replaced by shear thickening and viscosity increases with shear rate.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this paper we used computer simulations to study the dynamics of a compressible fluid in steady shear flow. We found that as the shear rate is increased the fluid develops a highly non-uniform density profile, with pronounced solid-like layering near the walls, the extent of which increases progressively with shear rate. This shear-induced layering originates in viscous heating of the fluid by the imposed shear that leads to the appearance of large temperature gradients between the bulk of the fluid and the confining walls which are kept at constant temperature (for technical reasons we thermostat the fluid layers near the walls rather than the walls themselves). The coupling between temperature and density gradients gives rise to the Ludwig-Soret effect and has been the subject of numerous studies in the past but, to the best of our knowledge, the present work is the first to demonstrate that such thermophoretic effects can take place in a *homogeneous fluid in shear flow*.

In addition to the study of the density and the temperature profiles we also looked at other dynamical properties of the fluid such as its velocity profile, shear stress and viscosity. We observed large deviations from linear velocity profiles, and other non-Newtonian phenomena at high shear rates, such as inhomogeneous stress distributions, shear thinning and shear thickening. While locking has been found in previous computer simulations in the limit of large wall roughness, the observation of shear-enhanced locking has not been reported prior to this work.

All the results reported so far were obtained for a particular value of temperature (0.44) and density (0.694), not far from the triple point of the two dimensional LJ system. We studied the behavior of the system at other temperatures and densities as well (not shown). As expected, we find that if the temperature is raised from 0.44 to 1.0 at triple point density (0.694) all the effects reported in this work (e.g., layering and deviations from linear velocity profile) are strongly suppressed. If the temperature is reduced towards the fluid-solid transition temperature of 0.4, the above effects are strongly enhanced but since under these conditions the lengthscale of density fluctuations becomes comparable to system size, we did not undertake a careful study of this regime. We found that both layering and locking effects can be enhanced by keeping the temperature constant (at 0.44) and increasing the density to 0.77 which is close to liquid-

solid coexistence density at this temperature. Since the results are qualitatively similar to the ones reported in this work, we will not present them here.

We would like to conclude with a comment on the experimental relevance of our results. Even though we simulated the flow of compressible fluids in two dimensions, we expect similar behavior to be observed in compressible near-critical fluids in three dimensions as well. While the shear rates reached in the simulations are unrealistically high, we believe that shear-induced heating of the kind described in our work can be experimentally realized under less extreme conditions in real fluids. Another interesting and experimentally-relevant possibility is that shear-induced thermophoresis can lead to spatial segregation in multicomponent fluid mixtures. MD simulations of such systems are currently under way.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge fruitful discussions with D. Osmanovic and D. C. Rapaport. YR's work was supported by a grant from the Israel Science Foundation.

- ¹A. Jabbarzadeh, J. D. Atkinson, and R. I. Tanner, Phys. Rev. E **61**, 690 (2000).
- ²C. Trozzi and G. Ciccotti, Phys. Rev. A **29**, 916 (1984).
- ³L. Bocquet and J.-L. Barrat, Phys. Rev. E **49**, 3079 (1994).
- ⁴P. A. Thompson and M. O. Robbins, Phys. Rev. A **41**, 6830 (1990).
- ⁵P. A. Thompson and S. M. Troian, Nature (London) **389**, 360 (1997).
- ⁶S. Bernardi, B. D. Todd, and D. J. Searles, J. Chem. Phys. **132**, 244706 (2010).
- ⁷X. Yong and L. T. Zhang, J. Chem. Phys. **138**, 084503 (2013).
- ⁸D. C. Rapaport, *The art of molecular dynamics simulation* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995).
- ⁹*Private discussions with D. C. Rapaport.*
- ¹⁰W. Loose and G. Ciccotti, Phys. Rev. A **45**, 3859 (1992).
- ¹¹X. Yong and L. T. Zhang, Microfluid. Nanofluid. **14**, 299 (2013).
- ¹²C. Ludwig, Sitzungsber. K. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. **20** 539 (1856).
- ¹³C. Soret, Compt. Rend. **91**, 289 (1880).
- ¹⁴S. R. De Groot and P. Mazur, *Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics* (Dover Publication Inc., New York, 1984).
- ¹⁵S. Duhr and D. Braun, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **103**, 19678 (2006).
- ¹⁶S. Duhr and D. Braun, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 168301 (2006).
- ¹⁷A. Würger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 138301 (2007).
- ¹⁸H. Brenner, Phys. Rev. E **82**, 036325 (2010).
- ¹⁹B.-J. de Gans, R. Kita, S. Wiegand, and J. Luettmmer-Strathmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 245501 (2003).